



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

58

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/818,062	03/26/2001	Sriram Haridas	81862.P214	9158

7590 04/28/2005

Sang Hui Michael Kim
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

SALL, EL HADJI MALICK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/818,062

Applicant(s)

HARIDAS ET AL.

Examiner

El Hadji M. Sall

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 21-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

HL

K

Art Unit: 2157

1. DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the correspondence filed on February 1, 2005.

Claims 1-19 and 21-25 are pending. Claim 20 is cancelled. Claims 1-19 and 21-25 represent method and system for a voice multicast hardware accelerator.

2. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-12, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaka U.S. 6,654,455 in view of Iwama et al. U.S. 6,600,735.

Isaka teaches the invention substantially as claimed including IP conference telephone compatible with IP-PBX systems (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Isaka teaches in a network device including a host system coupled to a memory to store data and a line card to interface with a plurality of user devices, a method comprising:

receiving a network packet including voice data by the host system (column 1, lines 57-62, Isaka discloses a conference trunk is interconnected to the highway for performing, upon receiving packets from telephone terminals (i.e. packets received from a telephone terminal includes "voice data"));

sending a voice packet related to the voice data to the line card without duplication, the voice packet including descriptor fields for multicasting the voice data (column 1, lines 62-65, Isaka discloses the at least three telephone terminal systems connected for a conference send packets of voice signals received from the telephone terminals to the network to address them to the conference trunk; column 7, lines 60-65, Isaka discloses a multicast router 70 is substituted; column 7, lines 26-32, Isaka discloses each receives the above voice packets via the IP network 10, and each analyze the headers of the packets, and the CPU 40 identifies a packet meant for the telephone) ;

selectively multicasting the voice data to the plurality of user devices based on the descriptor fields in the voice packet (column 2, lines 45-49, Isaka discloses each IP telephone 12 is a telephone terminal capable of selectively assembling a voice signal

Art Unit: 2157

into an IP packet and sending the packet to the IP network 10 or disassembling a received IP packet to thereby reproduces a voice signal; column 7, lines 65-67, Isaka discloses the multicast router 70 manages an IP multicast group that may be set up in the IP network 10a; column 7, lines 26-32, Isaka discloses each receives the above voice packets via the IP network 10, and each analyze the headers of the packets. For example, the CPU 40 identifies a packet meant for the telephone);

Isaka fails to teach storing the voice data in the memory; and selectively multicasting the voice data stored in the memory to the plurality of user devices based on the descriptor field in the voice packet.

However, Iwama teaches Internet telephone connection method, bandwidth controller and gate keeper. Iwama teaches storing the voice data in the memory (figure 9; column 14, lines 13-23, Iwama discloses figure 9 is functional block diagram showing a voice relay router...the storage device (1802) is a memory device such as RAM or the like which is contained in the router).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Isaka in view of Iwama to store the voice data in the memory of the multicast router; and selectively multicasting the voice data stored in the memory to the plurality of user devices based on the descriptor field in the voice packet. One would be motivated to do so to monitor communication quality (see abstract).

As to claims 2, 7, 12 and 22, Isaka teaches the method, the digital processing system, the apparatus and a medium of claims 1, 6, 11 and 21, wherein the receiving of

Art Unit: 2157

the network packet includes receiving an Internet Protocol (IP) packet having the voice data (column 2, lines 45-49, Isaka discloses each IP telephone 12 is a telephone terminal capable of selectively assembling a voice signal into an IP packet and sending the packet to the IP network 10 or disassembling a received IP packet to thereby reproduces a voice signal).

4. Claims 3, 8, 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaka U.S. 6,654,455, in view of Iwama et al. U.S. 6,600,735, and further in view of Onishi et al. U.S. 5,434,863.

Isaka teaches the invention substantially as claimed including IP conference telephone compatible with IP-PBX systems (see abstract).

As to claims 3, 8, 13 and 23, Isaka teaches the method, the digital processing system, the apparatus and the medium of claims 1, 6, 11, 21.

Isaka fails to teach the method of claim 1, wherein the descriptor fields include a memory pointer field, status field, or a data length field.

However, Onishi teaches internetworking apparatus for connecting plural network systems and communication network system composed of plural network systems mutually connected. Onishi teaches the descriptor fields include a memory pointer field, status field, mask field, or a data length field (figure 14; column 7, line 166-column 8,

Art Unit: 2157

line 10, Onishi discloses a routing table 400 is made up of a field 401 of an IP address for representing the destination network, subnet mask data 402 for representing subnet information of the destination network, and a pointer field for next-entry (i.e. different memory fields of 4 bytes are disclosed, and memory is described as an storage area holding bytes of data)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Isaka in view of Onishi to include in the descriptor fields a memory pointer field, status field, mask field, or a data length field. One would be motivated to do so to identify the routing information.

5. Claim 4-5, 9-10, 14, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaka U.S. 6,654,455 in view of Iwama et al. U.S. 6,600,735, in view of Onishi et al. U.S. 5,434,863, and further in view of Lin et al. U.S. 6,651,225.

Isaka teaches the invention substantially as claimed including IP conference telephone compatible with IP-PBX systems (see abstract).

As to claims 4, 9, 13 and 24, Isaka teaches the method, the digital processing system, the apparatus and the medium of claims 3, 8, 11 and 23, wherein the selective multicasting of the voice data include sending the voice data to selected user devices (column 2, lines 45-49, Isaka discloses each IP telephone 12 is a telephone

Art Unit: 2157

terminal...capable of selectively assembling a voice signal into an IP packet and sending the packet to the IP network 10 or disassembling a received IP packet to thereby reproduces a voice signal; column 7, lines 65-67, Isaka discloses the multicast router 70 manages an IP multicast group that may be set up in the IP network 10a; column 7, lines 26-32, Isaka discloses...each receives the above voice packets via the IP network 10, and each analyze the headers of the packets...the CPU 40 identifies a packet meant for the telephone...).

Isaka fails to teach multicast hardware accelerator is used to send the voice data to selected user devices based on the mask field.

However, Lin teaches dynamic evaluation logic system and method. Lin teaches a hardware accelerator (figure 2, item 120).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Isaka in view of Lin to use multicast hardware accelerator to send the voice data to selected user devices based on the mask field. One would be motivated to do so to allow multiple users doing interactive operations in a manner that allows each user to shift back and forth between hardware emulation and software simulation to discover and eliminate problems in the IC design.

As to claims 5, 10 and 25, Isaka teaches the method, the digital processing system and the medium of claims 4, 9 and 24.

Isaka fails to teach the multicast hardware accelerator includes a field programmable gate array (FPGA) device.

However, Lin teaches hardware accelerator includes a field programmable gate array (FPGA) device (column 42, lines 19-24, Lin discloses The RCC Hardware accelerator 2620, which is also referred to as the RCC Array in other sections of this patent specification, contains the reconfigurable array of logic elements (e.g., FPGA) that can model at least a portion of the user's design in hardware so that the user can accelerate the debugging process).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Isaka in view of Lin to provide a field programmable gate array (FPGA) device in the multicast hardware accelerator. One would be motivated to do so to allow the propagation detector in the FPGA chip alerts the global control unit of any input data that is currently propagating within the FPGA chips (see abstract).

6. Claim 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isaka U.S. 6,654,455, in view of Iwama et al. U.S. 6,600,735, and further in view of Lin et al. U.S. 6,651,225.

Isaka teaches the invention substantially as claimed including IP conference telephone compatible with IP-PBX systems (see abstract).

As to claim 16, Isaka teaches a network device comprising:

Art Unit: 2157

a host system including a host central processing unit (CPU) and an operating system, the host system to process a network packet including voice data received from a network (figure 5, item 70); and

a line card coupled to the host system and the buffer memory, the line card having a plurality of ports to interface to user devices to multicast the voice data from the plurality of ports by a single voice packet received from the host system (column 1, lines 62-65, Isaka discloses the at least three telephone terminal systems connected for a conference send packets of voice signals received from the telephone terminals to the network to address them to the conference trunk (i.e. multicasting the voice data to ports responsive to "voice packets" or voice signals, inherently, when the telephones send packet of voice signals to the conference trunk, it is to be multicast to multiple terminals); column 7, lines 60-65, Isaka discloses a multicast router 70 is substituted; column 7, lines 26-32, Isaka discloses each receives the above voice packets via the IP network 10, and each analyze the headers of the packets, and the CPU 40 identifies a packet meant for the telephone).

Isaka fails to teach a buffer memory to store data from processed packet by the host system.

However, Iwama teaches a buffer memory to store data from processed packets by the host system (figure 9; column 14, lines 13-23, Iwama discloses figure 9 is functional block diagram showing a voice relay router...the storage device (1802) is a memory device such as RAM or the like which is contained in the router).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Isaka in view of Iwama to introduce a buffer memory to store data from processed packet by the host system. One would be motivated to do so to retain information as close to the input/output loop as possible to reduce access time.

Isaka fails to teach a multicast hardware accelerator to multicast the voice data stored in the buffer memory to ports.

However, Lin teaches hardware accelerator (figure 2, item 120).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Isaka in view of Lin to provide a multicast hardware accelerator to multicast data stored in the buffer memory. One would be motivated to do so to allow multiple users doing interactive operations in a manner that allows each user to shift back and forth between hardware emulation and software simulation to discover and eliminate problems in the IC design.

As to claim 17, Isaka teaches the network device of claim 16.

Isaka fails to teach the multicast hardware accelerator includes a field programmable gate array (FPGA) device.

However, Lin teaches dynamic evaluation logic system and method. Lin teaches hardware accelerator includes a field programmable gate array (FPGA) device (column 42, lines 19-24, Lin discloses The RCC Hardware accelerator 2620, which is also referred to as the RCC Array in other sections of this patent specification, contains the

Reconfigurable array of logic elements (e.g.,FPGA) that can model at least a portion of the user's design in hardware so that the user can accelerate the debugging process).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Isaka in view of Lin to provide the multicast hardware accelerator includes a field programmable gate array (FPGA) device. One would be motivated to do so to allow the propagation detector in the FPGA chip alerts the global control unit of any input data that is currently propagating within the FPGA chips (see abstract).

As to claim 18, Isaka teaches the network device of claim 16, wherein the host system is to send a packet relating to the data stored in the buffer memory, the packet includes descriptor fields used to multicast the data stored in the buffer memory (column 2, lines 45-49, Isaka discloses each IP telephone 12 is a telephone terminal capable of selectively assembling a voice signal into an IP packet and sending the packet to the IP network 10 or disassembling a received IP packet to thereby reproduces a voice signal; column 7, lines 65-67, Isaka discloses the multicast router 70 manages an IP multicast group that may be set up in the IP network 10a; column 7, lines 26-32, Isaka discloses each receives the above voice packets via the IP network 10, and each analyze the headers of the packets. For example, the CPU 40 identifies a packet meant for the telephone);

As to claim 19, Isaka teaches the network device of claim 18.

Isaka fails to teach the method of claim 1, wherein the descriptor fields include a memory pointer field, status field, or a data length field.

However, Onishi teaches internetworking apparatus for connecting plural network systems and communication network system composed of plural network systems mutually connected. Onishi teaches the descriptor fields include a memory pointer field, status field, mask field, or a data length field (figure 14; column 7, line 66-column 8, line 10, Onishi discloses a routing table 400 is made up of a field 401 of an IP address for representing the destination network, subnet mask data 402 for representing subnet information of the destination network, and a pointer field for next-entry (i.e. different memory fields of 4 bytes are disclosed, and memory is described as an storage area holding bytes of data)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Isaka in view of Onishi to include in the descriptor fields a memory pointer field, status field, mask field, or a data length field. One would be motivated to do so to identify the routing information.

7. Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02/01/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2157

(A) As to claim 1, applicant stated that nothing in Iwana teaches or suggests storing voice data as claimed.

In regards to point (A), examiner respectfully disagrees, and further Iwana teaches storing voice data as claimed

On column 14, lines 13-23, Iwana discloses figure 9 is functional block diagram showing a voice relay router to route IP packets, in which there is a storage device (1802) that is a memory device such as RAM or the like which is contained in the router (i.e. IP packet is the voice data which is inherently stored in (1802) as it passes through the relay router).

Furthermore, applicant argues that monitoring communication quality under bandwidth reservation is unrelated to the teachings of Isaka. However, In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, one would be motivated to combine Isaka in view of Iwana to allow communication quality.

(B) As to claim 3, applicant respectfully submits that neither of these fields taught by Onishi is a memory pointer field, status field, mask field, or a data length field as those terms are defined by paragraph [0029] and [0030] of the specification.

In regards to point (B), examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

(C) As to claim 4, applicants respectfully submits that Lin is nonanalogous art and that one of ordinary skill in the art would be not be motivated to consider the teachings of Lin in connection with voice communication

In regards to point (C), examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to applicant's argument that Lin is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Lin is not nonanalogous. Though Lin teaches dynamic evaluation logic system and method, his invention discloses some features that are missing in claims 4-5, 9-10, 14, 24-25 and 16-19.

(D) As to claim 16, applicant respectfully submits that Isaka does not teach or suggest these elements comprising a single network device as claimed.

In regards to point (D), examiner respectfully disagrees.

Features such as comprising a single network device are not in the claims.

8.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to El Hadji M Sall whose telephone number is 571-272-4010. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 2157

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4010.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

El Hadji Sall
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2157



SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER

